

## **REMARKS**

Claims 3-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite, in that the limitation "the drive wheel" in claims 3-6 has insufficient antecedent basis. Responsive to the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 3-6 to be dependent solely on claim 2, which contains the required antecedent basis for the term "drive-wheel".

Claims 1 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1-2(b) as being anticipated by Shonnard, U.S. Patent No. 1,868,771. Claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Margles, U.S. Patent No. 2,211,427. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over Margles. Applicant respectfully traverses the grounds of rejection.

The claims of the present application recite an escalator construction in which the handrail is arranged on a balustrade which has a reversing zone in which the direction of travel of the handrail is reversed. A drivable reversing sheave is the means by which the handrail direction of travel may be reversed, the reversing sheave being driven peripherally.

Shonnard '771 depicts an escalator with a driving sheave 30 which the Examiner asserts is reversible and in which the structure inherently has drive means to power the sheave 30. It is respectfully submitted that Shonnard '771 provides insufficient teaching to assert that the sheave is driven peripherally. Indeed, it can be reasonably asserted that the structure of Shonnard depicts a pulley (shown in phantom) coaxial with the sheave on an axle, and that the sheave is thus driven by motor power applied to the pulley. Shonnard certainly does not assert or illustrate that its sheave is driven at its periphery, as is the present invention. It is thus submitted that Shonnard does not anticipate the present invention.

Similarly, Margles '427 illustrates an escalator in which the drivable reversing sheave 30 is coaxial with a pulley 26 which in turn is driven by belt 28 from drive wheel or pulley 25, which is in turn coaxial with pulley 23 driven by step chain 22. Clearly, reversing sheave 30 is **not** driven peripherally as that term is used in the present application, as there is no drive element which is in

drive contact with the periphery of the sheave. Indeed, neither Shonnard nor Margles provides any teaching or suggestion that the reversing sheave can be driven peripherally as claimed.

The present invention provides advantages over the prior art, and particularly Margles, in that the width of the balustrade, particularly in the region of the reversing sheave, need not be of a width or thickness necessary to accommodate both the reversing sheave and an adjacent drive member, such as Margles sprocket wheel 26. Rather, the reversing sheave is driven directly, and preferably at a lower portion of its periphery, whereby the balustrade, and particularly that portion of the balustrade surrounding the reversing sheave, can be of a narrow profile. Claim 3 recites that the handrail drive is arranged at the balustrade base. Margles '427 clearly presents its non-peripheral drive as located centrally to the reversing sheave, above the base.

As claims 1 and 7, the sole independent claims in the application, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the art of record, passage to allowance of all claims is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEITZER CORNMAN GROSS & BONDELL LLP  
**Customer No. 022831**  
Attorneys For Applicant  
292 Madison Avenue – 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
(646) 424-0770

BY

JAB/cw

  
JAY A. BONDELL, ESQ., REG. #28,188

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450, on January 26, 2005.

Carol L. Wood, Sender 